

Transport and Acceleration of Energetic Charged Particles near an Oblique Shock

D. Ruffolo

Department of Physics, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand

ABSTRACT

We have developed a numerical simulation code that treats the transport and acceleration of charged particles crossing an idealized oblique, non-relativistic shock within the framework of pitch angle transport using a finite-difference method. We consider two applications: 1) to study the steady-state acceleration of energetic particles at an oblique shock, and 2) to explain observed precursors of Forbush decreases of galactic cosmic rays before the arrival of an interplanetary shock induced by solar activity. For the former, we find that there is a jump in the particle intensity at the shock, which is stronger for more oblique shocks. Detailed pitch angle distributions are also presented. The simple model of a Forbush decrease explains the key features of observed precursors, an enhanced diurnal anisotropy extending several mean free paths upstream of the shock and a depletion of particles in a narrow loss cone at ~ 0.1 mean free path from the shock. Such precursors have practical applications for space weather prediction.

Subject headings: acceleration of particles — shock waves — cosmic rays — solar-terrestrial relations

1. Introduction

An amazing variety of astrophysical phenomena can be attributed to magnetohydrodynamic shocks, and in particular to their ability to accelerate charged particles to high energies (Blandford & Eichler 1987). Shock acceleration is believed to account for the bulk of the galactic cosmic rays (Axford 1981) and solar cosmic rays (Lee & Ryan 1986) observed near the Earth. There is a variety of mechanisms by which shocks can accelerate particles, as indicated by direct observations within the solar system. Diffusive shock acceleration (Krymskii 1977, Axford, Leer, & Skadron 1977, Bell 1978), based on the first-order Fermi acceleration mechanism (Fermi 1954, Parker 1958), can accurately account for acceleration at the Earth's bow shock (Eichler 1981, Ellison, Möbius, & Paschmann 1990) and traveling interplanetary shocks (Lee 1983, Kennel et al. 1986), whereas stochastic acceleration, or second-order Fermi acceleration (Fermi 1949), is apparently the dominant mechanism in the vicinity of cometary bow shocks (Terasawa & Scholer 1989).

Several lines of evidence indicate the distributed acceleration of energetic ions over a wide range of heliolongitudes during gradual solar flare/coronal mass ejection (CME) events (Mason, Gloeckler, & Hovestadt 1984, Lee & Ryan 1986, Reames 1990, Ruffolo 1997), presumably due to CME-driven shocks, though it is not clear whether the first- or second-order Fermi mechanism is responsible for initial particle acceleration near the Sun. As CME shocks move outward from the Sun, they become traveling interplanetary shocks, and as such a shock passes a detector, intensity enhancements or anisotropy variations of energetic particles are often recorded. Evidence that such intensity enhancements can represent true acceleration, not mere pile-up, comes from major spectral changes (McKibben 1972, Reames et al. 1997). At energies $\lesssim 1$ MeV, there is clear evidence that particles can be accelerated out of the solar wind population (Gosling et al. 1981), presumably by diffusive shock acceleration. However, for energies > 10 MeV, all observations to date of ionic charge states near the times of interplanetary shock arrivals are inconsistent with a solar wind origin, indicating that the ions were originally accelerated out of coronal material (Boberg, Tylka, & Adams 1996). In addition, Tan et al. (1989) provided compositional evidence that ions of ~ 1 MeV observed at the time of shock passage represent the

same population as ambient solar energetic particles. The above evidence indicates that particles are injected into the interplanetary medium while the shock is still near the Sun, and later this particle population may be further affected by the shock as it propagates through the inner heliosphere. This leads one to the question of how an oblique shock (i.e., a shock in which the magnetic field is neither parallel nor perpendicular to the shock normal) further accelerates existing populations of energetic charged particles.

Note that close to an oblique shock, the diffusion approximation does not provide an accurate description of the spatial or directional distribution of energetic particles. The goal of the present work is to examine the spatial and pitch angle distribution that arises due to the transport and acceleration of an existing particle population near an oblique shock. To the author's knowledge, this represents the first solution of the pitch angle transport equation on both sides of an oblique, non-relativistic shock for non-ultrarelativistic particles. (For ultrarelativistic particles at oblique shocks, for which one can set $E \approx pc$, see Kirk & Heavens 1989; for parallel shocks and non-relativistic particles, see Kirk & Schneider 1989.) Therefore, we have started with the simplest case of an oblique shock with a constant magnetic field on either side in a medium with a spatially uniform scattering mean free path (Figure 1). It is hoped that this will lay the groundwork for further studies of particle acceleration integrated into the framework of a pitch angle transport equation that will consider other effects for particular types of shocks; these could include a realistic magnetic field configuration, a spatially dependent scattering amplitude, a self-consistent treatment of wave generation and pitch angle scattering, or other effects.

The basic process of charged particle acceleration by planar, parallel shocks has been worked out in the diffusion approximation (e.g., Krymskii 1977, Blandford & Ostriker 1978). Decker & Vlahos (1986) and Jokipii (1987) found that for oblique shocks the rate of particle acceleration increases with the shock angle, i.e., the angle between the magnetic field and the shock normal. In addition, there is a characteristic length over which the particle distribution increases upstream of the shock, given by $D/u = v\lambda_{\parallel}/(3u)$, where D is the coefficient of spatial diffusion (due to pitch angle scattering), u is the fluid speed relative to the shock, v is the particle speed, and $\lambda_{\parallel}$ is the spatial mean free path along the magnetic field.

In the inner heliosphere, $\lambda_{\parallel}$ is typically 0.08 to 0.3 AU (Palmer 1982), and for $u \sim 0.002c$ and $v = 0.1c$ ($E = 94$ MeV), this length scale is on the order of $17\lambda_{\parallel}$, or 1.4 to 5 AU. Thus a model with a constant diffusion coefficient does not explain the more localized increases observed as an interplanetary shock passes the Earth. One explanation is that the diffusion coefficient may decrease near a shock due to increased magnetic turbulence generated by accelerated particles (e.g., McKenzie & Westphal 1968, Lee 1983, Reames, Barbier, & Ng 1996). On the other hand, the large changes in particle anisotropies that are sometimes observed during shock passage (e.g., Evenson, Meyer, & Yanagita 1982, Heras et al. 1995) indicate a breakdown in the diffusion approximation, so a detailed treatment should also consider the pitch angle distribution. Recently, the EPAM instrument on the ACE spacecraft has been able to measure complex pitch angle distributions close to the time of shock passage (Armstrong & Holland 1998); models of shock acceleration should attempt to reproduce such distributions. Furthermore, changes in the pitch angle distribution of relativistic ions (mainly galactic cosmic ray protons) as an interplanetary shock approaches, representing precursors to a Forbush decrease accompanying the shock (Forbush 1938, Berry & Hess 1942, Forbush & Lange 1942) can be measured by ground-based neutron monitors and could provide advance warning of approaching shocks (Bieber & Evenson 1997), which can induce geomagnetic storms and affect satellites, communications, and power grids at Earth. Clearly the implementation of such a warning system would rely on an accurate understanding of the pitch angle distribution of energetic ions upstream of an interplanetary shock.

Kirk & Schneider (1987a) presented an approximate analytic solution of a pitch angle transport equation for highly relativistic particles near a parallel shock discontinuity (i.e., one in which the magnetic field is parallel to the shock normal), giving insight into the variety of length scales corresponding to higher orders of anisotropy near the shock (the length scales also apply to non-relativistic particles). This work was extended to oblique shocks by Kirk & Heavens (1989). Monte Carlo techniques have provided important information on the pitch angle distribution near the shock (Kirk & Schneider 1987b, Naito & Takahara 1995), the final spectrum (Kirk & Schneider 1987b, Ballard & Heavens 1991, Lieu et al. 1994, Naito & Takahara 1995),

the rate of particle acceleration vs. the magnetic field-shock angle (Decker & Vlahos 1986, Lieu et al. 1994, Naito & Takahara 1995), the injection of particles from a thermal population and its decreased efficiency for larger magnetic field-shock angles (Baring, Ellison, & Jones 1993), compositional selection effects (Ellison, Jones, & Eichler 1981), and the relative importance of first- and second-order Fermi acceleration at shocks (Krüls & Achterberg 1994).

Here we adopt a different approach by incorporating the treatment of an oblique shock discontinuity into a finite-difference numerical solution of a pitch angle transport equation. Previously, numerical techniques have been developed to treat the pitch angle dependent transport of energetic particles in the inner heliosphere (Ng & Wong 1979, Schlüter 1985, Earl 1987, Ruffolo 1991, Pauls & Burger 1994), recently including the effects of adiabatic deceleration and convection (Ruffolo 1995, Hatzky 1996, Lario 1997, Kocharov et al. 1998), and these have been used to analyze observations of solar energetic particles (Bieber et al. 1980, Bieber, Evenson, & Pommerantz 1986, Dröge, Wibberenz, & Klecker 1990, Kallenrode, Wibberenz, & Hücke 1992, Ruffolo, Khumlumert, & Youngdee 1998) and solar neutron decay particles (Ruffolo 1991, Dröge, Ruffolo, & Klecker 1996). Including the injection of particles from other sources, such as a traveling interplanetary shock, has proven more difficult. Previous authors have set the simulation boundary at the shock and assumed an *ad hoc* particle injection function, say, Q , finding the function that best fits the observed data for a given event and energy range (Heras et al. 1995, Lario 1997, Kallenrode & Wibberenz 1997; Kallenrode 1997a, b). In principle this allows one to examine the dependence of Q on physical parameters of the shock, though there are a number of such inter-related parameters, which complicates the interpretation of the association between Q and any individual parameter. Our approach is in a sense the reverse: we examine what parameter dependence should be expected based on certain physical processes. Since diffusive shock acceleration is a manifestation of particle transport in the vicinity of the shock, we include both sides of the shock discontinuity in the calculation, with special treatment of particles crossing the shock based on the conservation of the magnetic moment, to examine both the transport and further acceleration of energetic charged particles near the shock. We are able to examine the effects of the shock-field an-

gle and the form of the pitch angle scattering on the steady-state particle distribution in space and pitch angle for an idealized model of an oblique shock. As a further application of our method, we apply it to explain the observed precursors of Forbush decreases before the arrival of an interplanetary shock.

2. Methodology

2.1. Overview

Before describing the methodology in detail, we present a brief overview of shock acceleration. The process of “diffusive shock acceleration” refers to the acceleration of charged particles as they are repeatedly scattered back and forth across a shock front, which for the present purposes is a discontinuity in the fluid speed and magnetic field strength. This process does not require the diffusion approximation and can be examined by lower-level descriptions in terms of pitch angle scattering (Kirk & Schneider 1987a) or particle orbits in a disordered magnetic field (Decker & Vlahos 1985).

Originally the literature discussed two mechanisms of acceleration at shocks:

1. In the first-order Fermi acceleration mechanism (Fermi 1954, Parker 1958), particles gain energy when scattering off of converging magnetic field irregularities. At a shock, this occurs because the field irregularities are convected with the fluid flow (in the régime in which the Alfvén speed is smaller than the fluid speed relative to the shock), and the upstream fluid flows toward the shock faster than the downstream fluid flows away. In this régime, scattering tends to isotropize the momentum while preserving its magnitude in the local fluid frame. When a particle heads toward the shock (in the local fluid frame) in either direction, the frame transformation leads to a higher momentum in the new local fluid frame, which is conserved until the particle encounters the shock again. After two such crossings of the shock, the particle has a higher momentum in its original reference frame.

2. In the shock drift mechanism (Schatzman 1963), particles drift along an oblique shock front due to the sharp gradient in the magnetic field, and this drift is along the direction of the electric field so that particles can gain a substantial amount of energy in one encounter with the shock.

More recently, it has been shown that the distinction between these two mechanisms vanishes in the

de Hoffmann-Teller (shock) frame (de Hoffmann & Teller 1950) where the electric field is zero. The entire energy change due to mechanisms 1 and 2 is accounted for by transforming the particle momentum from the local fluid frame into the shock frame, considering the energy-conserving shock encounter in the shock frame, and then transforming the momentum into the new local fluid frame (Decker 1983). [Note, however, that there is still a lateral drift along the shock, which is important, e.g., for the acceleration of anomalous cosmic rays at the solar wind termination shock (Pesses, Eichler, & Jokipii 1981, Cummings, Stone, & Webber 1985).] For an oblique shock, the term diffusive shock acceleration is now generally used to refer to this unified description of particle acceleration that includes both mechanisms 1 and 2.

The basic mechanism of particle acceleration at an oblique shock, as described above, includes two processes: a) frame transformations, as in first-order Fermi acceleration, and b) a change in pitch angle as the particle encounters the shock (which does not occur for a parallel shock). Processes a) and b) are related to parallel and perpendicular changes in the fluid velocity, respectively. Thus they are directly analogous to the two components of adiabatic deceleration in the solar wind (e.g., Webb & Gleeson 1979, Ruffolo 1995), which are associated with the divergence of the wind parallel and perpendicular to the magnetic field and have been termed “an inverse Fermi effect” and “betatron deceleration,” respectively. Just as betatron deceleration is an effect of adiabatic focusing (also known as magnetic mirroring) when viewed in the local fluid frame (Ruffolo 1995), which in turn represents the conservation of the magnetic moment $p_{\perp}^2/(2meB)$, for the case of shock acceleration the change in pitch angle as particles encounter the shock approximately conserves the magnetic moment as well (see §2.5). If we assume that the magnetic moment is actually conserved, then we do not need to concern ourselves with the details of the particle orbit near the shock; we treat the entire particle-shock interaction as a single event, and consider whether a particle ultimately crosses or is reflected by the shock, which is assumed to depend only on the initial pitch angle.

Figure 2 provides a schematic illustration (for a non-relativistic particle) of acceleration at an oblique shock. [For an analogous illustration for adiabatic deceleration, see Figure 1 of Ruffolo (1995).] The components of the particle velocity, $v_{\parallel}$ and $v_{\perp}$, refer to

motion parallel and perpendicular to the magnetic field, respectively (the pitch angle is the angle with respect to the positive $v_{\parallel}$ axis). Let us take the upstream direction to be to the right; then the upstream and downstream flow speeds with respect to the shock frame are negative (“U” and “D,” respectively, in Figure 2). A particle with $v_{\parallel} < 0$ is moving from the upstream side toward the downstream side. The velocity relative to point “D” is greater than that relative to point “U,” so if the particle crosses to the downstream side, the magnitude of its velocity is greater in the new local fluid frame, and this velocity magnitude is conserved by further scattering in that frame. Similarly, a particle with $v_{\parallel} > 0$ can cross from downstream to upstream, and again the magnitude of the velocity increases in the new local fluid frame. A third type of shock encounter (for oblique shocks) is when a particle from upstream ($v_{\parallel} < 0$) reflects back upstream with $v_{\parallel} \rightarrow -v_{\parallel}$ in the shock frame; again, we see that the magnitude of the velocity increases in the fluid frame.

In addition to the frame transformations described above, i.e., standard first-order Fermi acceleration for parallel shocks, at oblique shocks there is the additional process of a change in pitch angle as a particle crosses the shock. At first glance it is not immediately obvious why this process should lead to acceleration as opposed to deceleration. To see this, consider again a particle with $v_{\parallel} < 0$ crossing the shock from upstream to downstream (Figure 2). In the shock frame the large-scale magnetic field configuration is static, so the particle speed in this frame, $\sqrt{v_{\parallel}^2 + v_{\perp}^2}$, is conserved. If we assume approximate conservation of the magnetic moment, then $v_{\perp}$ will increase, since the magnetic field is stronger on the downstream side. As can be seen in Figure 2, the speed relative to the downstream fluid (“D”) increases; the dotted line indicates a curve of constant speed in the downstream fluid frame. Thus this process leads to an additional increase in energy in the new local fluid frame, beyond that due to the frame transformation. Similarly, a particle with $v_{\parallel} > 0$ is moving from downstream to upstream, and approximate conservation of the magnetic moment implies a decrease in $v_{\perp}$. Then the speed relative to the upstream fluid (“U”) increases; the dashed line indicates a curve of constant speed in the upstream fluid frame. The change in pitch angle can be quite large, so this can lead to a substantial increase in the energy gain at oblique shocks. There can also be a significant effect on the pitch angle distribu-

tion, which makes particle transport and acceleration at oblique shocks more difficult to model than that at parallel shocks.

2.2. Transport Equation

To our knowledge, this work represents the first treatment of oblique shock acceleration within a finite difference simulation of pitch angle transport, so as a first step this work considers only a simple, planar, oblique shock with straight magnetic field lines on either side (Figure 1). We consider only subluminal shocks so that we can work in the de Hoffmann-Teller reference frame (which we also refer to as the “shock frame”) in which the shock is stationary, the fluid flow is parallel to the magnetic field, and the electric field is zero (de Hoffmann & Teller 1950).

Ruffolo (1995) provided an equation of focused pitch angle transport (eq. [11] of that paper) that included solar wind effects, such as adiabatic deceleration and convection, to first order in u/c in an Archimedean spiral magnetic field. When we consider a region of constant magnetic field on either side of the shock, that equation reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F(t, \mu, z, p)}{\partial t} = & -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mu v F(t, \mu, z, p) \\ & -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(1 - \mu^2 \frac{v^2}{c^2} \right) u F(t, \mu, z, p) \\ & + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \frac{\varphi(\mu)}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \left(1 - \mu \frac{uv}{c^2} \right) \\ & \cdot F(t, \mu, z, p), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $F \equiv d^3N/(dzd\mu dp)$ is the density of particles in a given magnetic flux tube,
 t is the time in the shock frame,
 μ is the pitch angle cosine in the wind frame,
 z is the distance from the shock along the magnetic field in the shock frame,
 p is the particle momentum in the wind frame,
 v is the particle velocity in the wind frame,
 u is the solar wind speed along the magnetic field in the shock frame, and
 φ is the pitch angle scattering coefficient.

In equation (1), the first term on the right hand side represents the effect of streaming, the second is for convection (including the relativistic correction

for transforming the streaming speed into the shock frame), and the third is for pitch angle scattering. The particle density in a flux tube, F , is related to the phase space density, f , by $F = 2\pi ap^2 f$, where $a(z) \propto 1/B(z)$ is the cross-sectional area of the flux tube. We use F in the simulations, following Ng and Wong (1979), because we can easily design the numerical finite difference method to strictly conserve this quantity during streaming and convection, even when $a(z)$ and $B(z)$ are spatially varying. The pitch angle scattering coefficient, $\varphi(\mu)$, is expressed as

$$\varphi(\mu) = A|\mu|^{q-1}(1 - \mu^2) \quad (2)$$

where A is the scattering amplitude and q controls the form of the scattering coefficient. This expression, originally derived in the context of quasi-linear theory (Jokipii 1971), is adopted as a convenient and widely used parameterization. In this work we will consider $q = 1$, for isotropic scattering, and $q = 1.5$, which is in the range of 1.3 to 1.7 inferred by Bieber et al. (1986) for interplanetary scattering. Roughly speaking, $q > 1$ implies a deficit in scattering near a pitch angle of 90° ($\mu = 0$); the effect of such a deficit on shock acceleration has also been examined by Kirk (1988).

2.3. Eigenfunction Expansion

In addition to our numerical solution of equation (1) (see §2.6), it is possible to find analytic solutions in the steady state if we restrict the z domain to one side of the shock. Setting $\partial F/\partial t = 0$, we have

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial z} = \frac{A}{2[\mu v(1 - \mu uv/c^2) + u]} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu}(1 - \mu^2)|\mu|^{q-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \left(1 - \mu \frac{uv}{c^2}\right) F. \quad (3)$$

Note that F is defined in a mixed frame, i.e., for μ and p defined in the solar wind frame and z and t in the shock frame. To first order in u/c , the analogous quantity defined in terms of variables in the solar wind frame is given by $F_w = (1 - \mu uv/c^2)F$ (Webb & Gleeson 1979), so we can simplify equation (3) to read

$$\frac{\partial F_w}{\partial z} = \frac{A}{2[\mu v + u]} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu}(1 - \mu^2)|\mu|^{q-1} \frac{\partial F_w}{\partial \mu}, \quad (4)$$

again neglecting terms of order $(u/c)^2$. For a given p , this can be solved by separation of variables, $F_w(\mu, z) = M(\mu)Z(z)$, yielding $Z \propto e^{kz}$ and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu}(1 - \mu^2)|\mu|^{q-1} \frac{\partial M}{\partial \mu} - \alpha \left(\mu + \frac{u}{v}\right) M = 0, \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha \equiv 2kv/A$ is an eigenvalue of the equation. To avoid divergence as $z \rightarrow \pm\infty$, we must have $k \leq 0$ (≥ 0) for $z > 0$ (< 0). Following Kirk & Schneider (1987a), who treated the case of $q = 1$, $M(\mu)$ can be expanded in terms of normalized Legendre polynomials. For q and u/v values of interest, we truncated the expansion to n terms and evaluated eigenvalues and eigenfunctions using the Mathematica software package (Wolfram Research, Inc.). For $q = 1$, $n = 12$ was sufficient to obtain eigenvalues with a relative accuracy of 10^{-5} . For $q = 1.5$, obtaining an accuracy of about 2% for the first positive eigenvalue required $n \approx 80$; for other eigenvalues fewer terms were required.

The eigenvalues α closest to zero (corresponding to long spatial scales) are shown in Figure 3 for $q = 1$ and 1.5 and a range of u/v values. For $u/v = 0$, the numerical values of α are 0, ± 14.53 , ± 42.05 , ± 83.30 , ± 138.3 , ... for $q = 1$ and 0, ± 11.3 , ± 33.0 , ± 65.6 , ± 109 , ... for $q = 1.5$. For a given q the relative magnitudes of these eigenvalues are similar, but not identical, to those of the Legendre polynomials, $\ell(\ell+1)$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. The eigenvalues shown in Figure 3 for $q = 1.5$ are about 20% lower in magnitude than those for $q = 1$, with the exception that α_1 is lower by a factor of about 2.4. Aside from α_1 , the eigenvalues shown here are approximately given by $\alpha_i = \alpha_i^0(1 \pm \beta u/v)$, where α_i^0 is the value for $u/v = 0$, “ $\pm$ ” follows the sign of α_i^0 , and β is a constant between 2.2 and 2.4. Sample normalized eigenfunctions for these eigenvalues are shown in Figure 4 for $q = 1$ and $u/v = -0.075$, with particles traveling away from the shock for $\mu < 0$ downstream and $\mu > 0$ upstream; each eigenfunction $M(\mu)$ is plotted with the sign for which $\langle M \rangle > 0$. In cases considered in this paper, $uv/c^2 \ll 1$, so $F_w \approx F$ and M essentially gives the angular dependence of F .

For $u/v > 0$, there is a zero eigenvalue, α_0 , with a corresponding constant eigenfunction, and a first positive eigenvalue, α_1 , which tends to zero as $u/v \rightarrow 0$. For $q = 1$, $\alpha_1 \approx 6u/v$ (with slight deviations for higher u/v), implying that $k \approx 3uA/v^2$. Note that in the diffusion approximation, the spatial diffusion coefficient is given by the classic formula (Jokipii 1966, 1968, Hasselmann & Wibberenz 1968),

$$D = \frac{v^2}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{(1 - \mu^2)^2}{\varphi(\mu)} d\mu, \quad (6)$$

and for the form of $\varphi(\mu)$ specified in equation (2), we

have the well-known expression

$$D = \frac{v^2}{A} \frac{1}{(2-q)(4-q)}. \quad (7)$$

For $q = 1$ we have $D = v^2/(3A)$, and the approximate z -dependence corresponding to the first positive eigenvalue is $Z \propto e^{uz/D}$; such a dependence is also found for the case of $q = 1.5$. Note that this solution only applies to the region where $uz < 0$, i.e., the upstream region. In general, solutions corresponding to positive (negative) α are valid in the upstream (downstream) region, and the constant eigenfunction corresponding to $\alpha_0 = 0$ is valid in either region.

The complete solution for F in the steady state on either side of the shock is a linear combination of the separable solutions. Therefore, the solution far upstream of the shock is a superposition of a constant and the above solution proportional to $e^{uz/D}$. Since $|\alpha_{-1}| \gg \alpha_1$, the only valid solution far downstream of the shock is a constant. Such spatial behavior of F at long distances from the shock is in accordance with standard results based on the diffusion approximation (e.g., Krymskii 1977; see also §2.5), though there are slight deviations at higher u/v (for $q = 1$, $\alpha_1 > 6u/v$ by $\approx 2\%$ at $u/v = 0.1$). At shorter distances there may be contributions from solutions corresponding to other eigenvalues. In terms of the particle mean free path,

$$\lambda = \frac{3D}{v} = \frac{v}{A} \frac{3}{(2-q)(4-q)}, \quad (8)$$

such solutions decay over a distance scale of

$$\frac{1}{k} = \frac{2}{\alpha} \frac{v}{A} = \frac{2(2-q)(4-q)}{3\alpha} \lambda. \quad (9)$$

(The symbol λ refers to the mean free path parallel to the magnetic field, $\lambda_{\parallel}$, unless otherwise specified.) For $q = 1$ and $u/v = 0.02$, deviations from the solution given by the standard diffusive approximation are expected upstream within $1/k = 0.13\lambda$ of the shock (corresponding to α_2) and downstream within 0.14λ (corresponding to α_{-1}); for $q = 1.5$ those distance scales become 0.07λ and 0.08λ , respectively.

Note that this analysis alone cannot give the relative amplitudes of different solutions; for that, one must consider how particles cross the shock. Kirk & Schneider (1987a) presented eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of equation (5) for the case of $q = 1$, and for the case of ultrarelativistic particle energies ($E \approx pc$) and a parallel shock, were also able to match

the upstream and downstream solutions and analytically evaluate the steady-state distribution function, as well as the power-law index of the resulting spectrum. The analogous calculation for oblique shocks was performed by Kirk & Heavens (1989). For parallel shocks, Kirk & Schneider (1989) relaxed the assumption of ultrarelativistic particle velocities in calculating the steady-state particle distribution as a function of position, pitch angle, and momentum. In this work, we treat the crossing of moderately relativistic particles across an oblique shock in numerical (finite difference) solutions of the pitch angle transport equation, and we also compare our steady-state numerical results with pitch angle distributions and spatial decay constants, k , that are expected based on the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of equation (5), respectively.

In summary, the results for steady-state shock acceleration can be expressed in terms of a superposition of separable solutions of equation (3). A numerical solution of equation (1), in our case by a finite difference method, is required in order to determine the relative amplitudes of the separable solutions. We stress that the numerical method does not explicitly involve the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions, so we can test the numerical code by verifying that the results are consistent with a linear combination of separable solutions.

2.4. Fluid and Magnetic Field Parameters

Based on equations (133)-(135) and (124) of de Hoffmann & Teller (1950), the jump conditions of a non-relativistic shock in the de Hoffmann-Teller frame are

$$\begin{aligned} \left[u_n + \frac{3}{5} \frac{u_s^2}{u_n} + \frac{u_{An}^2 t^2}{2u_n} \right] &= 0 \\ \left[\left(u_n - \frac{u_{An}^2}{u_n} \right) t \right] &= 0 \\ \left[\frac{3}{2} u_s^2 + \frac{1}{2} u_n^2 (1 + t^2) \right] &= 0 \\ \left[\frac{u_{An}}{\sqrt{u_n}} \right] &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where a bracketed quantity refers to the difference between that quantity on either side of the shock, $u_s = \sqrt{(5/3)(p/\rho)}$ is the speed of sound, $u_{An} \equiv B_n/\sqrt{4\pi\rho}$ is the Alfvén speed corresponding to B_n (hence the Alfvén speed is $u_A = u_{Az} \sec \theta$), and $t = \tan \theta$, where θ is the angle between the magnetic field and the

shock normal. In the above, we used the conservation of mass flux and assumed an ideal gas with an adiabatic index of 5/3. Analogous conditions for relativistic shocks were derived by Heavens & Drury (1988).

Equations (10) relate u_n , u_s , u_A , and t upstream and downstream of the shock, so given any four of those variables the remaining four can be determined. We use the subscript 1 (2) to refer to upstream (downstream) variables. Solutions were obtained for $u_{s1} = u_{A1} = 50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, typical of near-Earth interplanetary space, and selected values of t_1 and $u_{1n} - u_{2n}$. Note that in the high speed limit $u_{1n}/u_{2n} \rightarrow 4$, i.e., $(\gamma + 1)/(\gamma - 1)$ for an adiabatic index $\gamma = 5/3$. In this limit, the magnetic field tension becomes negligible, and the tangential component of the velocity, $u_n t$, is nearly conserved, so we have $t_2/t_1 \rightarrow 4$ as well.

The only fluid parameters that directly affect the particle transport are the fluid speed upstream and downstream and the magnetic compression ratio, B_2/B_1 . Since the normal component of $\vec{B}$ is conserved, we have $B_2/B_1 = \sec \theta_2 / \sec \theta_1$. Figure 5 shows the shock compression ratio, u_{1n}/u_{2n} , and the magnetic compression ratio, B_2/B_1 , as a function of $\Delta u_n = u_{1n} - u_{2n}$ for selected values of $t_1 = \tan \theta_1$. Since $t_2/t_1 \rightarrow 4$ in the limit of high Mach numbers, the asymptotic value of the magnetic compression ratio is $\sqrt{(1 + 16t_1^2)/(1 + t_1^2)}$, which is less than 4. To examine the effect of B_2/B_1 on cosmic ray transport and acceleration near the shock, we perform simulations for $u_{1n} - u_{2n} = 400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and $t_1 = 0, 1$, and 4, corresponding to upstream shock angles of 0° , 45° , and 76° and downstream shock angles of 0° , 76° , and 86° , respectively. Complete fluid and magnetic field parameters for these configurations are given in Table 1. We do not consider $t > 4$ because we expect that our model would be inaccurate for nearly perpendicular shocks in that it neglects particle diffusion perpendicular to the magnetic field, which is important for highly oblique shocks (e.g., Jones, Jokipii, & Baring 1998).

2.5. Boundary Conditions

Next we consider changes in the momentum and pitch angle as a charged particle encounters the shock, i.e., a sudden change in the magnetic field and fluid speed. Following Decker (1983), we assume that in the shock frame both the particle momentum and the

first adiabatic invariant, i.e., the magnetic moment $p_\perp^2/(2meB)$, are conserved. The above assumption is tantamount to considering the adiabatic limit, in which the shock is a region where the pitch angle changes gradually. The opposite limit would consider an infinitely thin shock front, and in this case the pitch angle distribution can only be determined by computing particle orbits. For highly oblique shocks ($\theta \gtrsim 80^\circ$), there is essentially no difference between the resulting pitch angle distributions in the two limits (Terasawa 1979). Therefore, the approximation we are using should be reliable for highly oblique shocks, and at least represents a well-defined limit for less oblique shocks.

The original simulation code of Ruffolo (1995) is capable of treating multiple values of the momentum in order to examine the particle distribution as a function of the momentum. However, for simplicity we have only treated one value of the momentum in this work, and have assumed that the dependence of $F(t, \mu, z, p)$ on p is given by a power law, $F \propto p^{-\gamma}$. When particles are accelerated during an encounter with the shock, we consider them to be advected from a lower value of the momentum to the momentum of interest. Therefore, we should evaluate the accuracy of the assumption that F has the same dependence on μ and z at the lower values of p from which particles are advected. For non-relativistic particles with $u < v$, the largest fractional momentum change that can be achieved (that for reflection back upstream) is $< 2u_1/v$ (see Figure 2). In Figure 3 we see that the dependence of the eigenvalues α on u/v is linear or weaker for u/v values of interest. As will be described in §3.1, we do in fact see a systematic error in some results that increases with u_1/v . For ultrarelativistic particle speeds (e.g., Kirk & Schneider 1987a) the assumption of a power-law dependence in the steady state is not a problem because $v \approx c$ so that u/v does not vary with momentum.

Now we turn to the boundary conditions at the edges of the simulation region. At a reasonable distance from the shock front, we can employ the diffusion approximation, in which equation (1) can be expressed as a diffusion-convection equation. In the manner of Earl (1974), we set $F(t, p, \mu, z) \approx F_0(t, p, z) + F_1(p, \mu, z)$, where $F_0 \equiv \langle F \rangle_\mu$, F_1 is an odd function of μ , and higher-order even functions are neglected. By separating the transport equation into odd and even parts, integrating each over μ , and neglecting the time dependence of F_1 (i.e., assuming

$|\partial F_1/\partial t| \ll |v\partial F_0/\partial z|$, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial F_0}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial S_z}{\partial z}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$S_z = uF_0 - D\frac{\partial F_0}{\partial z} \quad (12)$$

is the z -flux and the spatial diffusion coefficient, D , is given by equation (6). Equation (11) should be obeyed on either side of the shock, with special jump conditions at the shock as described above. Note that either F or the phase space density, f , may be used in these equations and in the following discussion.

We note further that in terms of $F_1(p, \mu, z)$, we have

$$S_z = u \left(1 - \frac{1}{3}v^2c^2 \right) F_0 + \frac{v}{2} \int_{-1}^1 \mu F_1 d\mu, \quad (13)$$

and if $F_1 = \delta\mu$, so that δ is the dipole anisotropy in the mixed frame, we obtain

$$S_z = uF_0 + \frac{v}{3} \left(\delta - \frac{uv}{c^2} \right) F_0, \quad (14)$$

where $\delta - uv/c^2$ represents the dipole anisotropy of F_w , the distribution function defined entirely in terms of independent variables in the solar wind frame.

In the diffusion approximation solution of Krymskii (1977), there are boundary conditions that F remain finite as $z \rightarrow \pm\infty$. In the steady state, equation (11) requires that S_z be constant on either side of the shock, so we have

$$F_0 = A + B \exp \left(\frac{u}{D} z \right) \quad (15)$$

with different constants A and B upstream or downstream. To avoid divergence far downstream, we must have $B = 0$, so F_0 is constant, with $S_z = uF_0$. Upstream, we have $S_z = uF_u$, where F_u is F_0 far upstream of the shock, representing the existing particle population that is accelerated by the shock.

In the numerical solution of equation (1) in terms of z we can only treat a finite domain. However, the diffusion approximation is valid sufficiently far from the shock (see §2.3), with $\partial S_z/\partial z = 0$, so setting S_z at the boundaries of the simulation region is approximately equivalent to fixing its value at $\pm\infty$. At the upstream boundary, we set S_z to a constant (for a given p) that is interpreted as uF_u . At the downstream boundary, S_z is set to $u\langle F \rangle_\mu$ at the boundary.

In the diffusion approximation (eq. [12]), this implies that $\partial F_0/\partial z = 0$, and also that the anisotropy is given by $\delta = uv/c^2$; the distribution function in the wind frame is $F_w = (1 - \mu uv/c^2)F$ and thus has a dipole anisotropy of zero.

2.6. Numerical Method

The numerical simulations reported here employed the finite difference method of Ruffolo (1995) as substantially modified by Nutaro, Riyavong, & Ruffolo (in preparation). The latter report will contain details of the modifications and testing of the new code. Here, for completeness, we briefly outline the changes to the treatment of streaming and convection, and the treatment of particles crossing the shock. For a description of other aspects of the numerical method which remain unchanged, the reader is referred to Ruffolo (1995).

Changes to the treatment of streaming and convection were motivated by the work of Hatzky (1996), who used the total variation diminishing (TVD) technique (Sweby 1984). While our previous numerical method (Ruffolo 1991, 1995) eliminated spatial differencing and hence numerical diffusion in the evaluation of these terms, it required a small step size, $\Delta z = \Delta\mu v\Delta t$. On the other hand, the TVD algorithm permits only a very small amount of numerical diffusion for significantly larger Δz . The result is that the new code runs 1 to 2 orders of magnitude faster.

Another benefit is that convection is now treated in each step instead of by occasional jumps as in our previous method, yielding much smoother profiles without spatial averaging. The previous method was adequate for the transport of solar energetic particles, where one could average over a moderate spatial interval, and the jumps merely yielded small-amplitude oscillations in the intensity as a function of time. However, for the present simulations of steady-state shock acceleration, with multiple reflections from the boundaries and a requirement of fine spatial resolution, the new treatment of streaming and convection was essential in obtaining the smooth profiles shown here. The results for steady-state particle acceleration at a parallel shock provide a sensitive test confirming the accurate treatment of streaming and convection.

In our implementation, we modified the standard TVD algorithm in order to permit a Courant number, $\gamma = v_z\Delta t/\Delta z$, greater than one. This permits an arbitrary Δz , and in particular, for $\Delta z = \Delta\mu v\Delta t$ we

were able to reproduce results for solar energetic particles that used our previous code (Ruffolo & Khumlert 1995).

The other modification of the code was to treat how particles cross the shock, which was also part of the streaming/convection step. For each μ - z grid point, we determine whether particles will stream/convect as far as the shock. If so, we perform a Lorentz transformation into the shock frame, allow particles to cross or reflect while conserving the magnetic moment, and perform another Lorentz transformation back into the local wind frame (see §2.1). The TVD algorithm effectively splits a cell into fractions of particles destined to move to two different spatial locations; at the shock we generalize this approach to split cells into fractions destined to move to different μ -cells as well. The accuracy of this technique is verified by the numerical results for steady-state shock acceleration at oblique shocks, which are consistent with a sum of separable solutions of the transport equation (§2.3) on either side of the shock.

3. Results

3.1. Steady-State Shock Acceleration

In a steady state, an equilibrium is reached in the evolution of the particle distribution function in terms of position, pitch angle, and momentum. In the present simulations, we assume that the momentum dependence is given by $F \propto p^{-\gamma}$, so we find the value of γ that yields a steady solution for F in terms of z and μ . Figure 6 indicates the flux balance that determines γ . Well away from the shock, we can use the diffusion approximation (see §2.5) to say that the net z -flux far downstream is due to convection: $S_z = u_2 F_0$, where $F_0 = \langle F \rangle_\mu$. Far upstream, there is a balance between convection toward the shock and diffusion away, so that $S_z = u_1 F_u$, where F_u is the far upstream flux. Here we set $F_u = 0$, so there is a net outflow of particles from the shock in the downstream direction. This is balanced by the p -flux, S_p , representing acceleration at the shock of particles from lower momenta to the momentum of interest, as well as from the momentum of interest to higher momenta, for the appropriate steady-state power-law index, γ .

Before considering oblique shocks, we tested our methodology for the case of a parallel shock ($\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 0$). Fluid and magnetic field parameters were as listed in Table 1. We considered protons with speeds $v = 0.5$ and $0.1c$, corresponding to kinetic

energies of 145 and 4.7 MeV and momenta of 541.7 and 94.3 MeV c^{-1} , respectively. We used grid spacings of $\Delta z/\lambda = 0.025$ and 0.005 , respectively, and $\Delta\mu = 2/95$. For convenience, we set $v\Delta t = \Delta z$. Outer boundaries were placed at $\pm 2.5\lambda$ and $\pm 0.5\lambda$ for $v = 0.5c$ and $0.1c$, respectively. The numerical treatment of the boundary conditions assumed $F_u = 0$ and was sufficiently accurate that the proper behavior of F in the diffusion approximation was maintained out to within a few grid points from the boundaries, and the location of the boundaries did not influence F near the shock. A full simulation required about 2 hours of CPU time on a Sun Ultra-1 workstation.

Figure 7 (top panel) shows the spatial dependence of the pitch angle averaged phase space distribution, $\langle f \rangle_\mu$, near a parallel shock for $v = 0.5c$ and $q = 1$ ($z > 0$ is the upstream region). As explained in §2.2, our simulations solve for $F = d^3N/(dzd\mu dp)$, the density of particles in a flux tube, which is related to f by $F = 2\pi a p^2 f$, where a is the cross-sectional area of a flux tube; therefore, $f \propto BF$. For a parallel shock, B is equal on the upstream and downstream side, so $f \propto F$. Throughout this section, f is normalized to 1 far downstream. From Figure 7 we see that for a parallel shock, the spatial dependence of $\langle f \rangle_\mu$ is simply that expected in the diffusion approximation (§2.5), i.e., constant downstream and exponentially decaying to zero upstream with $k = u/D$. The pitch angle dependence was also the same as in the diffusion approximation. The same results were obtained for $q = 1.5$ and for $v = 0.1c$ with $q = 1$ and 1.5 .

For a coarser μ -grid spacing, a spurious peak was obtained in $\langle f \rangle_\mu$, which tends toward zero as $\Delta\mu \rightarrow 0$ (a remnant of this is barely visible in the top panel of Figure 7). Even for a fine grid spacing, one anomaly is that a value of $\gamma = 2.020$ was needed for a steady state (i.e., to conserve the flux of particles in the simulation region) for $v/c = 0.5$ or 0.1 and $q = 1$ or 1.5 , whereas acceleration theory for parallel shocks (e.g., Krymskii 1977) yields $\gamma = 3u_2/(u_1 - u_2) + 1$ or 2.034 for these fluid parameters. The assumptions of that theory should apply given that $f(\mu, z)$ is that expected from the diffusion approximation. We believe that the systematic error in γ obtained from the simulations arises from the assumption of a power-law dependence of F on p , which neglects the momentum dependence of $F(\mu, z)$ (see §2.5). The key problem is that the upstream anisotropy of F depends on u_1/v . As a test, the code was modified to artificially add an “extra” anisotropy for lower momenta, i.e., to

multiply F upon acceleration by a μ -dependent factor to account for the higher anisotropy of F at the lower momentum from which a particle was accelerated, yielding a similar $F(\mu, z)$ and $\gamma = 2.041$. We conclude that this explanation can in fact account for a systematic error in γ of the observed magnitude, and that γ is more sensitive to the assumption of a power-law dependence than is the distribution of particles in space or pitch angle.

Turning to oblique shocks, Figure 7 shows the spatial dependence of $\langle f \rangle_\mu$ for $\tan \theta_1 = 1$ and 4 and for $q = 1$ and 1.5. In all cases, the distribution function farther from the shock is consistent with the diffusion approximation, with $\langle F \rangle_\mu$ constant downstream and exponentially decaying upstream with $k = u/D$. A conspicuous feature of Figure 7 is the jump (discontinuity) in $\langle f \rangle_\mu$ at an oblique shock (the finite slope is due to the finite grid spacing in z). This feature was also found in simulations by Ostrowski (1991), Gieseler et al. (1998), and T. Naito (private communication, 1998). Gieseler et al. (1998) present a detailed theoretical and computational analysis of this feature, as well as possible observational signatures. We find that the jump is stronger for more oblique shocks, and weaker for $q = 1.5$ than for $q = 1$. The amplitude of the jump is on the order of a few percent for such fast particles ($v = 0.5c$), and our simulations indicate that the jump is stronger for slower particles ($v = 0.1c$), i.e., a higher u/v .

Another difference from the case of a parallel shock is that for oblique shocks, additional eigenfunctions are excited in $f(\mu, z)$ near the shock. (If one is not sufficiently careful in treating the boundary conditions, as I was not during the initial stages of this work, additional eigenfunctions are also excited near the boundaries; discretization errors also yield spurious eigenfunctions near the shock, which become negligible for 95 μ -grid points as used here.) For all steady-state simulations, $f(\mu, z)$ was consistent with a sum of separable solutions of equation (3). For $\tan \theta_1 = 4$ ($\theta_1 = 75^\circ$), Figure 8 shows the dependence of f on μ and z within $\pm 0.8\lambda$ of the shock, and Figure 9 shows f as a function of μ for $z = \pm 0.05\lambda$. (Recall that we use μ and p to refer to quantities in the local fluid frame; thus these plots are for a constant value of the local p . A Compton-Getting transformation to the shock frame would have no noticeable effect on our distribution plots.) For $\tan \theta_1 = 1$, the results were qualitatively similar but with weaker anisotropies.

In Figure 9, we see that upstream distributions

(thick lines) increase with μ up to $\mu \approx 0.7$ (with a slightly stronger anisotropy than in the far upstream region), and for greater μ values, f drops sharply. The reason for the sharp drop is that given our assumption of conservation of the magnetic moment, particles with $\mu > \sqrt{1 - B_1/B_2}$, or 0.85 in this case, have come from downstream. A similar drop in f has been called a “deficit cone” (Nagashima et al. 1992) or “loss cone” effect (Bieber & Evenson 1997) for the case of galactic cosmic ray (GCR) depletion at high μ upstream of an interplanetary shock, which is due to the paucity of GCR coming from downstream (see §3.2). The same effect occurs here because the acceleration of particles coming from downstream is weaker than for particles reflected from upstream. The greatest acceleration occurs for particles reflected with the greatest change in pitch angle (see Figure 2), i.e., for μ slightly below 0.85. Since stronger acceleration implies that f is advected from lower momenta, and the particle spectrum increases with decreasing momentum in this case, the strongest acceleration corresponds to the greatest increase in f .

In the downstream region, particles are redistributed in pitch angle because of changes in pitch angle as particles cross the shock; the average flux also increases slightly due to acceleration. It is worth noting that for a highly oblique shock, most particles coming from upstream are in fact reflected, i.e., when $|\mu| < \sqrt{1 - B_1/B_2}$, or in the case of a strong, highly oblique shock, for pitch angles more than 30° from the magnetic field direction. Another feature of Figures 8 and 9 is the sharp gradient in f at $\mu = 0$ for the case of $q = 1.5$. For this form of the pitch angle diffusion coefficient, $\varphi(\mu) = A|\mu|^{0.5}(1 - \mu^2)$ tends to zero as $\mu \rightarrow 0$. Since the μ -flux, $S_\mu = -(\varphi/2)(\partial F/\partial \mu)$, is slowly varying in a near-equilibrium situation, the vanishing diffusion coefficient at $\mu = 0$ is able to sustain an infinite gradient in F at that value.

We believe that this behavior of f as a function of z and μ is not an artifact of the assumption of a power-law momentum dependence because when an extra anisotropy was artificially added, the μ and z dependence (including the jump at $z = 0$) was not significantly affected; this was also the case for parallel shocks. On the other hand, computed values of γ are strongly affected by the power-law assumption, so that this code in its present form is essentially unable to determine γ . The error in γ was much weaker for $v/c = 0.5$ than for $v/c = 0.1$ (because of the lower u_1/v ratio). As an example, for $q = 1$ the γ values

required for a steady state with $v = 0.5c$ were 1.965 and 1.952 for $\tan \theta_1 = 1$ and 4, respectively, while with $v = 0.1c$ they were 1.985 and 1.787, respectively. Otherwise, the results regarding $f(\mu, z)$ for $v/c = 0.1$ were qualitatively similar to those shown in Figures 7 to 9 for $v/c = 0.5$, with much stronger anisotropies and jumps in $\langle f \rangle_\mu$ at the shock.

3.2. Precursors of Forbush Decreases

To demonstrate the versatility of this method, we apply it to model Forbush decreases of galactic cosmic rays (GCR) as an interplanetary shock passes the Earth (Forbush 1938, Berry & Hess 1942, Forbush & Lange 1942), which represent a transient phenomenon instead of a steady state. Ground-based neutron monitors measure secondary neutrons from the impact of relativistic, primary charged particles, mainly protons, on the upper atmosphere. Due to selective deflection by the Earth's magnetic field, neutron monitor observations are sensitive to primary cosmic rays from specific directions in space, and the worldwide network of neutron monitors provides detailed information on their pitch angle distribution, sensitive to variations on the order of 0.1%. Precursors to Forbush decreases are of practical interest as possible predictors of space weather effects on the Earth, such as satellite failures, radio fade-outs, power outages, etc., several hours or even days before the passage of a major interplanetary shock. Several analyses of neutron monitor observations have indicated two types of precursors to Forbush decreases: 1) an enhanced diurnal anisotropy of GCR, with an excess of particles traveling toward the Sun along the interplanetary magnetic field, and 2) a deficit of GCR in a “loss cone,” i.e., along a narrow range of pitch angles directed nearly along the interplanetary magnetic field away from the Sun (Nagashima et al. 1992, Nagashima, Fujimoto, & Morishita 1994, Sakakibara et al. 1995, Belov et al. 1995, Cane, Richardson, & von Rosenvinge 1996, Bieber & Evenson 1997).

We model the Forbush decrease in a rather idealized manner, assuming the configuration of Figure 1 and neglecting particle drifts (Nishida 1983, Kadokura & Nishida 1986), spatial dependence of the scattering mean free path, shock curvature, the finite spatial extent of the interplanetary shock, adiabatic focusing, and adiabatic deceleration. Nevertheless, we can explain the basic features of the observed precursors, verifying their interpretation in terms of particle transport in the vicinity of an oblique shock.

The simulation conditions were inspired by the dramatic CME event of 1997 April 7, which arrived near Earth on April 10-11, and for which a possible loss cone feature is identified by Bieber & Evenson (1997). In this case, the travel time of 3 days indicates a shock speed of $\approx 600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ or only 200 km s^{-1} faster than the (typical) solar wind speed. Assuming that the shock normal is radial, we take the upstream shock-field angle to be the typical “garden-hose” angle of 45° ($\tan \theta_1 = 1$), and as before we assume $u_{s1} = u_{A1} = 50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. Thus we find $\Delta u_n = 133 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, $\tan \theta_2 = 3.20$, and $B_2/B_1 = 2.37$, which in turn implies that particles crossing the shock from downstream have pitch angles aligned with the magnetic field to within 40° ($\mu > 0.76$). We used $q = 1.5$, which adequately describes interplanetary scattering (Bieber et al. 1986). For the upstream boundary condition, we specify a constant F_u (see §2.5), and the initial condition sets F to that constant in the upstream region and to zero in the downstream region. We used $\Delta\mu = 2/45$ (45 μ -grid points) and $\Delta z/\lambda = 0.05$, where $\lambda = 0.3 \text{ AU}$. We considered $v = 0.75c$, corresponding to a kinetic energy of 480 MeV. For the momentum spectrum, we assumed $F \propto p^{-1}$, according to the model proton spectrum of Reinecke, Moraal, & McDonald (1996) for the similar polarity solar cycle of 1977. However, the simulation results were very insensitive to the GCR spectral index.

Figure 10 shows the omnidirectional GCR intensity as a function of position (normalized to 1 just upstream of the shock). As the shock moves past a fixed observer, one sees a gradual precursor decline and a slight recovery as the shock approaches. Such gradual declines in some observations were noted by Cane et al. (1996). In their one figure for such a Forbush decrease, that of 1972 Oct 31 (Figure 5 of that paper), it is seen that 2 out of 3 neutron monitor stations observed a relative peak near the time of shock onset. It would be interesting if the omnidirectional flux could be estimated from the worldwide neutron monitor network for such events for direct comparison with the results of numerical simulations.

At the shock itself, we see a jump reminiscent of that found in §3.1 for shock acceleration with $F_u = 0$ (Figure 7; see also Ostrowski 1991, Gieseler et al. 1998). Thus this model predicts a discontinuous drop at the shock followed by a more gradual decline which we identify as the declining slope of a Forbush decrease. We note, however, that this model cannot hope to accurately reproduce the detailed features of

the Forbush decrease itself, given its simplistic assumptions (see also §4).

The phase space distribution, f , as a function of μ and z is shown in Figure 11, and pitch angle distributions in the near upstream ($z = 0.05\lambda$) and far upstream ($z = \lambda$) regions are shown in Figure 12. We see that there is an overall enhanced sunward anisotropy both downstream and upstream, where it persists over several mean free paths from the shock. Close to the shock, we also find the second type of observed precursor feature with a sharp decline in the loss cone region.

Our numerical simulations indicate that $f(\mu, z)$ upstream is approximately given by a sum of steady-state separable solutions. If a steady state has not been achieved, separable solutions of the full transport equation involve an eigenvalue equation similar to equation (5) with $u/v \rightarrow u/v - 1/(kv\tau)$, where τ is the decay time. Given the weak sensitivity of eigenvalues to u/v (except α_1), the longest-lived solutions should be similar to the steady-state solutions of equation (5) with some modification to k . The time scale of evolution of a Forbush decrease, ~ 1 day, is much longer than the travel time of particles across the distance scales of interest, ~ 10 minutes, so it is reasonable that transient solutions have disappeared leaving only nearly stationary solutions of the transport equation.

Both types of observed precursors of Forbush decreases are readily understood in terms of the upstream simulation results, as expressed as a superposition of separable solutions of equation (3). The constant solution in the far upstream region corresponds to the zero eigenvalue. The contribution of the first eigenfunction is opposite in sign to that seen in §3.1, corresponding to an anisotropy directed toward the Sun over a long spatial scale. Turning to the next eigenfunction, corresponding to α_2 , the spatial decay scale of the steady-state eigenfunction is $0.074\lambda_{\parallel}$, and in the time-dependent simulations this feature has a spatial scale length of $\approx 0.08\lambda_{\parallel}$ along the magnetic field, or $\approx 0.11\lambda_r$ in the radial direction. This eigenfunction appears with the same sign as in Figure 4 for shock acceleration (Figure 9) and represents a deficit of particles in the loss cone ($\mu \gtrsim 0.76$) that came from the downstream region which is depleted in GCR, as well as an enhancement of particles with μ just below 0.76 which were accelerated during reflection from the shock. Several examples of loss-cone deficits were given by Nagashima et al. (1994)

and Sakakibara et al. (1995), and an enhancement for certain pitch angles corresponding to reflection and acceleration at the shock was reported by Belov et al. (1995). The predicted spatial decay length for these features depends only weakly on the shock speed or obliquity (i.e., the eigenvalues depend only weakly on u_1/v , especially for relativistic velocities), but there is a significant dependence on q (see eq. [9]).

The results shown here, with precursor features roughly of the magnitude reported by Cane et al. (1996), were for a simulated duration of 7.4 hours, which is substantially shorter than the actual time it takes a shock to propagate from the Sun to the Earth (typically 2 to 4 days). This is probably due to our neglect of enhanced spatial diffusion near the shock, which must be present in order to account for the sharp GCR gradient at the onset of a Forbush decrease. Stronger scattering would stem the tide of equilibration and lead to a longer duration of these features.

4. Discussion

The numerical simulation procedure developed in this work is the first to solve a pitch angle transport equation on both sides of an oblique, non-relativistic shock without assuming an ultrarelativistic particle velocity. Here we have shown applications of the technique to study oblique shock acceleration in the steady state, and to consider the time-dependent problem of Forbush decreases and in particular their precursors. To explore the capabilities and limitations of this type of solution, we have started with the simplest case of a plane-parallel, oblique shock with straight magnetic field lines on either side (Figure 1) and a spatially uniform scattering mean free path. Clearly this simple model is neglecting a variety of important processes, which will be discussed shortly.

One limitation in this work was our assumption of a power-law dependence of the distribution function on the particle momentum. In further work this assumption should be relaxed, i.e., the simulations should treat different values of the momentum, as has been done by Kirk & Schneider (1989). This assumption has strongly affected calculated values of the particle spectrum, but based on test runs that artificially compensate for the error, it seems not to have significantly affected the spatial and pitch angle distributions. This should be checked in future work. Monte

Carlo (MC) techniques are undoubtedly more popular than the finite difference method used here, and MC simulations are very well-suited for exploring certain phenomena. Here we use a finite difference method for consistency with an existing code that includes a variety of effects known to be important for interplanetary transport (Ruffolo 1995) so that the treatment of the shock can be readily incorporated into such simulations. For transport simulations in general, finite difference or eigenfunction expansion techniques have some advantages, such as often requiring less computing time, the absence of statistical error, straightforward extrapolation to reduce discretization error, easier treatment of a high dynamic range in particle density, and a straightforward and continuous implementation of analytic expressions for scattering and other processes (for a comparison of different techniques, see Earl et al. 1995). The last of these is also a notable limitation in situations where analytic expressions are not available, e.g., situations requiring the tracing of particle orbits. If the tracing of particle orbits is only necessary near the shock, that could be implemented in a finite difference code by a “transfer matrix” based on a one-time evaluation of the probability of various outcomes at the shock for each μ -grid point.

To the author’s knowledge, calculated pitch angle distributions for steady-state acceleration of energetic particles at a non-relativistic oblique shock have not reported previously. Such pitch angle distributions should be directly comparable with recent and upcoming *in situ* observations near interplanetary shocks. As observed distributions are reported in greater detail, they can be expected to challenge the theoretical models and help indicate which additional physical processes have important effects on particle transport and acceleration at interplanetary shocks.

The pitch angle distributions for steady-state shock acceleration represent the superposition of pitch angle eigenfunctions with different amplitudes, as first described by Kirk & Schneider (1987a). The amplitudes of different eigenfunctions can only be determined by treating how particles cross the shock. The upstream pitch angle distributions obtained here for oblique, non-relativistic shocks and mildly relativistic particles (Figure 9) are qualitatively very different from those found for parallel, relativistic shocks and ultra-relativistic particles (Kirk & Schneider 1987a,b, Heavens & Drury 1988). In contrast to the non-relativistic

case, those authors found that even for a parallel shock, eigenfunctions beyond those present in the diffusion approximation are excited. The upstream pitch angle distribution is highly collimated in the direction away from the shock. The downstream distribution for the parallel, mildly relativistic shock ($u_1 = 0.3c$) is qualitatively similar to what we find for oblique, non-relativistic shocks. Our results can be more directly compared with the pitch angle scattering results of Naito & Takahara (1995), who treated oblique, mildly relativistic shocks with $u_1 = 0.1c \cdot \sec \theta_1$. We find qualitatively similar upstream pitch angle distributions but very different downstream distributions; for high obliquity (and high u_1) those of Naito & Takahara (1995) are strongly collimated with particles moving away from the shock.

The second application considered here, to precursors of Forbush decreases of galactic cosmic rays (GCR), demonstrates the ability of this method to simulate time-dependent phenomena. The eigenfunction analysis alone is sufficient to specify that in a steady state, one can have certain types of features in the pitch angle distribution over certain distance scales. For example, the observed increase in diurnal anisotropy well before the onset of some interplanetary shocks (e.g., Cane et al. 1996, Bieber & Evenson 1997) is identified with the eigenvalue α_1 and a long distance scale, and the superimposed excess for μ up to ≈ 0.5 and strong deficit thereafter (Nagashima et al. 1992, 1994, Sakakibara et al. 1995) is identified with the eigenvalue α_2 and a distance scale of $\sim 0.1\lambda$. The time-dependent simulations are necessary to verify that these modes are in fact excited with the appropriate sign and a reasonable amplitude, and that the time-dependent, upstream distribution is approximately represented by a superposition of steady-state eigenfunctions (which is not the case downstream).

We note that simulations of a Forbush decrease with a parallel shock did not exhibit features corresponding to α_2 , which is an example of how not all eigenfunctions are excited in every situation. Since a localized deficit in a narrow loss cone is in fact not expected for a parallel shock, this supports the physical explanation that the upstream deficit over a narrow range of pitch angles corresponds to particles crossing from the downstream region which is depleted in GCR (Nagashima et al. 1992).

As stressed earlier, this model of a Forbush decrease is idealized in many ways, though it seems to be adequate for describing the key features of upstream

precursors, which are of practical interest for short-term space weather forecasting (Bieber & Evenson 1997) by warning of the impending impact of a major interplanetary shock. We are much more hesitant to apply this idealized model to the Forbush decrease itself. However, according to Wibberenz, Cane, and Richardson (1997), the key features of a Forbush decrease can be captured by assuming enhanced scattering (a lower mean free path) in the region just downstream of the shock. This could easily be included in a simulation technique such as ours and a comparison with particle distributions observed during the course of Forbush decreases could help identify what physical processes are crucial to the Forbush decrease phenomenon.

A key motivation for this work is the potential to include more physical effects in the future. For a more realistic magnetic field configuration, transport effects such as adiabatic focusing and deceleration can readily be included, as they have already been included in numerical simulations of interplanetary transport. Enhanced scattering near a shock almost certainly affects acceleration and transport in that region, yet the magnitude and extent of such scattering for high-energy particles is not well understood. Concrete models of the spatial dependence of the mean free path near a shock should be developed and tested for their success in explaining *in situ* observations.

The author is grateful to Paul Evenson, Wolfgang Dröge, and Marty Lee for useful discussions and suggestions. In the formative stages of this work, I greatly benefited from lectures at the JSPS-ICRR International Spring School in Tokyo during February, 1995, and especially from those given by Toshio Terasawa. I particularly want to thank the Thailand Research Fund for their support of this research. I am also grateful for the kind hospitality of the Bartol Research Institute of the University of Delaware, where part of this research was performed under the support of NASA grant NAG 5-2606.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, T. P., & Holland, G. G. 1998, *Eos Trans. Am. Geophys. Union*, 79, no. 17, Suppl., 2562
- Axford, W. I. 1981, *Proc. 17th Internat. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Paris)*, 12, 155
- Axford, W. I., Leer, E., & Skadron, G. 1977, *Proc. 15th Internat. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Plovdiv)*, 11, 132
- Ballard, K. R., & Heavens, A. F. 1991, *MNRAS*, 251, 438
- Baring, M. G., Ellison, D. C., & Jones, F. C. 1993, *ApJ*, 409, 327
- Bell, A. R. 1978, *MNRAS*, 182, 147
- Belov, A. V., Dorman, L. I., Eroshenko, E. A., Iucci, N., Villoresi, G., & Yanke, V. G. 1995, *Proc. 24th Internat. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Rome)*, 4, 888
- Berry, E. B., & Hess, V. F. 1942, *Terr. Mag.*, 47, 251
- Bieber, J. W., Earl, J. A., Green, G., Kunow, H., Müller-Mellin, R., & Wibberenz, G. 1980, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 85, 2313
- Bieber, J. W., & Evenson, P. A. 1997, *Proc. 25th Internat. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Durban)*, 1, 341
- Bieber, J. W., Evenson, P. A., & Pomerantz, M. A. 1986, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 91, 8713
- Blandford, R., & Eichler, D. 1987, *Phys. Rep.*, 154, 1
- Blandford, R. D., & Ostriker, J. P. 1978, *ApJ*, 221, L29
- Boberg, P. R., Tylka, J. A., & Adams, J. H., Jr. 1996, *ApJ*, 471, L65
- Cane, H. V., Richardson, I. G., & von Rosenvinge, T. T. 1996, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 21561
- Cummings, A. C., Stone, E. C., & Webber, W. R. 1986, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 91, 2896
- Decker, R. B. 1983, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 88, 9959
- Decker, R. B. & Vlahos, L. 1985, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 90, 47
- Decker, R. B. & Vlahos, L. 1986, *ApJ*, 306, 710
- de Hoffmann, F., & Teller, E. 1950, *Phys. Rev.*, 80, 692
- Dröge, W., Ruffolo, D., & Klecker, B. 1996, *ApJ*, 464, L87, astro-ph/9604019
- Dröge, W., Wibberenz, G., & Klecker, B. 1990, *Proc. 21st Internat. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Adelaide)*, 5, 187
- Earl, J. A. 1974, *ApJ*, 193, 231
- Earl, J. A. 1987, *Proc. 20th Internat. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Moscow)*, 3, 198
- Earl, J. A., Ruffolo, D., Pauls, H. L., & Bieber, J. W. 1995, *ApJ*, 454, 749
- Eichler, D. 1981, *ApJ*, 244, 711
- Ellison, D. C., Jones, F. C., & Eichler, D. 1981, *J. Geophys.*, 50, 110
- Ellison, D. C., Möbius, E., & Paschmann, G. 1990, *ApJ*, 352, 376
- Evenson, P., Meyer, P., & Yanagita, S. 1982, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 87, 625
- Fermi, E. 1949, *Phys. Rev.*, 75, 1169
- Fermi, E. 1954, *ApJ*, 119, 1
- Forbush, S. E. 1938, *Terr. Mag.*, 43, 203
- Forbush, S. E., & Lange, I. 1942, *Terr. Mag.*, 47, 331
- Gieseler, U. D. J., Kirk, J. G., Gallant, Y. A., & Achterberg, A. 1998, *A&A*, submitted
- Gosling, J. T., Asbridge, J. R., Bame, S. J., Feldman, W. C., Zwickl, R. D., Paschmann, G., Sckopke, N., & Hynds, R. J. 1981, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 86, 547
- Hasselmann, K. & Wibberenz, G. 1968, *Z. Geophys.*, 34, 353
- Hatzky, R. 1996, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. Kiel
- Heavens, A. F., & Drury, L. O'C. 1988, *MNRAS*, 235, 997
- Heras, A. M., Sanahuja, B., Lario, D., Smith, Z. K., Detman, T., & Dryer, M. 1995, *ApJ*, 445, 497
- Jokipii, J. R. 1966, *ApJ*, 146, 480
- Jokipii, J. R. 1968, *ApJ*, 152, 671
- Jokipii, J. R. 1971, *Rev. Geophys. Space Phys.*, 9, 27
- Jokipii, J. R. 1987, *ApJ*, 313, 842

- Jones, F. C., Jokipii, J. R., & Baring, M. G. 1998, *ApJ*, in press, astro-ph/9808103
- Kadokura, A., & Nishida, A. 1986, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 91, 13
- Kallenrode, M.-B. 1997a, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 22335
- Kallenrode, M.-B. 1997b, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 22347
- Kallenrode, M.-B., & Wibberenz, G. 1997, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 22311
- Kallenrode, M.-B., Wibberenz, G., & Huckle, S. 1992, *ApJ*, 394, 351
- Kennel, C. F., Coroniti, F. V., Scarf, F. L., Livesey, W. A., Russell, C. T., Smith, E. J., Wenzel, K. P., & Scholer, M. 1986, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 91, 11917
- Kirk, J. G. 1988, *ApJ*, 324, 557
- Kirk, J. G., & Heavens, A. F. 1989, *MNRAS*, 239, 995
- Kirk, J. G., & Schneider, P. 1987a, *ApJ*, 315, 425
- Kirk, J. G., & Schneider, P. 1987b, *ApJ*, 322, 256
- Kirk, J. G., & Schneider, P. 1989, *A&A*, 225, 559
- Kocharov, L., Vainio, R., Kovaltsov, G. A., & Torsti, J. 1998, *Sol. Phys.*, 182, 195
- Krülls, W. M., & Achterberg, A. 1994, *A&A*, 286, 314
- Krymskii, G. F. 1977, *Sov. Phys. Dokl.*, 22, 327
- Lario, D. 1997, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. Barcelona
- Lee, M. A. 1983, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 88, 6109
- Lee, M. A., & Ryan, J. M. 1986, *ApJ*, 303, 829
- Lieu, R., Quenby, J. J., Drolas, B., & Naidu, K. 1994, *ApJ*, 421, 211
- Mason, G. M., Gloeckler, G., & Hovestadt, D. 1984, *ApJ*, 280, 902
- McKenzie, J. F., & Westphal, K. D. 1968, *Phys. Fluids*, 11, 2350
- McKibben, R. B. 1972, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 77, 3959
- Nagashima, K., Fujimoto, K., & Morishita, I. 1994, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 99, 21419
- Nagashima, K., Fujimoto, K., Sakakibara, S., Morishita, I., & Tatsuoka, R. 1992, *Planet. Space Sci.*, 40, 1109
- Naito, T., & Takahara, F. 1995, *MNRAS*, 275, 1077
- Ng, C. K., & Wong, K.-Y. 1979, *Proc. 16th Internat. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Kyoto)*, 5, 252
- Nishida, A. 1983, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 88, 785
- Ostrowski, M. 1991, *MNRAS*, 249, 551
- Palmer, I. D. 1982, *Rev. Geophys. Space Phys.*, 20, 335
- Parker, E. N. 1958, *Phys. Rev.*, 109, 1328
- Pauls, H. L., & Burger, R. A. 1994, *ApJ*, 427, 927
- Pesses, M. E., Eichler, D., & Jokipii, J. R. 1981, *ApJ*, 246, L85
- Reames, D. V. 1990, *ApJ*, 358, L63
- Reames, D. V., Barbier, L. M., & Ng, C. K. 1996, *ApJ*, 466, 473
- Reames, D. V., Barbier, L. M., von Rosenvinge, T. T., Mason, G. M., Mazur, J. E., and Dwyer, J. R. 1997, *ApJ*, 483, 515
- Reinecke, J. P. L., Moraal, H., & McDonald, F. B. 1996, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 21581
- Ruffolo, D. 1991, *ApJ*, 382, 688
- Ruffolo, D. 1995, *ApJ*, 442, 861, astro-ph/9408056
- Ruffolo, D. 1997, *ApJ*, 481, L119, astro-ph/9702160
- Ruffolo, D., & Khumlumert, T. 1995, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 22, 2073, astro-ph/9506133
- Ruffolo, D., Khumlumert, T., & Youngdee, W. 1998, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, 20591, astro-ph/9806097
- Sakakibara, S., et al. 1995, *Proc. 24th Internat. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Rome)*, 4, 896
- Schatzman, E. 1963, *Ann. d'Astr.*, 26, 234
- Schlüter, W. 1985, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. Kiel
- Sweby, P. K. 1984, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 21, 995
- Tan, L. C., Mason, G. M., Klecker, B., & Hovestadt, D. 1989, *ApJ*, 345, 572

Terasawa, T. 1979, *Planet. Space Sci.*, 27, 193

Terasawa, T., & Scholer, M. 1989, *Science*, 244, 1050

Webb, G. M., & Gleeson, L. J. 1979, *Ap&SS*, 60, 335

Wibberenz, G., Cane, H. V., & Richardson, I. G. 1997, *Proc. 25th Internat. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Durban)*, 1, 397

Fig. 1.— Model configuration in the de Hoffmann-Teller frame, in which the shock is stationary, the fluid flow $\vec{u}$ is parallel to the magnetic field $\vec{B}$, and the electric field is zero.

Fig. 2.— Illustration of changes in pitch angle when a particle crosses an oblique shock, a process which contributes to particle acceleration. Here $v_{\parallel}$ and $v_{\perp}$ are components of the particle velocity in the shock frame. See text for details.

Fig. 3.— Eigenvalues closest to zero for equation (5) as a function of u/v for $q = 1$ (solid lines) and $q = 1.5$ (dashed lines).

Fig. 4.— Eigenfunctions of equation (5) for eigenvalues shown in Figure 3 for $u/v = -0.075$ and $q = 1$. For steady-state shock acceleration, the pitch angle distribution is a linear combination of such functions. Particle motion is directed away from the shock for $\mu < 0$ downstream and $\mu > 0$ upstream.

Fig. 5.— Fluid compression ratio, u_{1n}/u_{2n} , and magnetic compression ratio, B_2/B_1 , as a function of the normal velocity jump in the shock frame, $\Delta u_n = u_{1n} - u_{2n}$, for $t_1 = \tan \theta_1 = 0, 0.5, 1, 2$, and 4.

Fig. 6.— Schematic illustration of the balance of spatial and momentum fluxes in diffusive shock acceleration.

Fig. 7.— Spatial dependence of the pitch-angle averaged phase space distribution function, $\langle f \rangle_{\mu}$, for steady-state particle acceleration near a shock (at $z = 0$) for various values of $\tan \theta_1$, the tangent of the angle between the magnetic field and the shock normal, for $q = 1$ (solid lines) and 1.5 (dotted lines), and for $v = 0.5c$. Farther from the shock, $\langle f \rangle_{\mu}$ is constant downstream and exponentially decays toward zero upstream. The ordinate is normalized to the value far downstream.

Fig. 8.— Phase space distribution of particles as a function of μ and z (in units of λ) near an oblique shock with $\tan \theta_1 = 4$ for a) $q = 1$ and b) $q = 1.5$. Note the changes in the pitch angle distribution near the shock (at $z = 0$).

Fig. 9.— Phase space distribution of particles as a function of μ near an oblique shock with $\tan \theta_1 = 4$ for $q = 1$ (solid lines) and $q = 1.5$ (dashed lines) at $z = 0.05\lambda$ (upstream; thick lines) and $z = -0.05\lambda$ (downstream; thin lines).

Fig. 10.— Spatial dependence of the pitch-angle averaged phase space distribution function, $\langle f \rangle_\mu$, of galactic cosmic rays near an oblique interplanetary shock ($\tan \theta_1 = 1$). As the shock moves (to the right) past a fixed observer, one sees a gradual precursor decline and a slight recovery, followed by a discontinuous decrease at the onset of a Forbush decrease.

Fig. 11.— Phase space distribution of particles as a function of μ and z (in units of λ) near an oblique interplanetary shock ($\tan \theta_1 = 1$). The sharp drop downstream ($z < 0$) represents the Forbush decrease; upstream ($z > 0$) features represent precursors that may be useful for space weather prediction. Superimposed on the enhanced sunward anisotropy, note the unusual pitch angle distribution just upstream of the shock.

Fig. 12.— Phase space distribution of galactic cosmic rays as a function of μ near an oblique interplanetary shock ($\tan \theta_1 = 1$) at $z = 0.05\lambda$ (solid line) and $z = \lambda$ (dashed line), representing near upstream and far upstream precursors of a Forbush decrease.

TABLE 1
SELECTED SOLUTIONS OF SHOCK JUMP CONDITIONS^a

$\tan \theta_1$	$\tan \theta_2$	u_{1n}	u_{2n}	B_2/B_1
0	0	538.0	138.0	1.00
1	3.88	541.5	141.5	2.83
4	15.11	544.3	144.3	3.67

^aFor $u_{A1} = u_{s1} = 50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. All velocities are in units of km s^{-1} .



















